Construction of a Channel Code from an Arbitrary Source Code with Decoder Side Information

Jun Muramatsu

arXiv:1601.05879v1 [cs.IT] 22 Jan 2016

***Abstract*—The construction of a channel code by using a source code with decoder side information is introduced. For the construction, any pair of encoder and decoder is available for a source code with decoder side information. A constrained-random-number generator, which generates random numbers satisfying a condition specified by a function and its value, is used to construct a stochastic channel encoder. The result suggests that we can divide the channel coding problem into the problems of channel encoding and source decoding with side information.**

***Index Terms*—Shannon theory, channel coding, source code with decoder side information, constrained-random-number generator**

I. Introduction

The source coding with decoder side information (Fig. 1) is a sub-problem of the distributed coding of correlated sources introduced by Slepian and Wolf [32]. Let (X^n, Y^n) be a pair of correlated sources. We consider a source code where an encoder transmits a codeword obtained from a source output X^n and a decoder reproduces X^n from the codeword and the side information Y^n, where it is expected that the decoding error probability is close to zero. From the Slepian-Wolf theorem [32], the asymptotically optimum encoding rate for stationary memoryless sources is given by the conditional entropy $H(X|Y)$. The result is extended to general correlated sources $(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y})$ in [23], where conditions such as stationarity and ergodicity are not assumed and the fundamental limit is given by the conditional spectral sup-entropy rate $\overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y})$. This paper considers a pair of general correlated sources $(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y})$, and the results can be applied to the stationary memoryless case.

The main result of this paper is that we can construct a channel code (Fig. 2) from a given source code of $\boldsymbol{X}$ with decoder side information $\boldsymbol{Y}$, where the channel input and output are given by $\boldsymbol{X}$ and $\boldsymbol{Y}$, respectively. It should be noted that the source code is not assumed to achieve the fundamental limit $\overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y})$ and the channel code may not achieve the capacity. However, we can construct a code that achieves the capacity by letting $\boldsymbol{X}$ be an optimum channel input random variable and using a source code achieving the limit $\overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y})$.

Historically, the Slepian-Wolf codes are constructed by using channel codes. In [32], the code is given by using a set of randomly-generated channel codewords that covers the conditionally typical set of X for a given Y. Wyner [35] introduced the Slepian-Wolf code by using parity check matrices, where it is shown by Elias [11] that the capacity of a binary symmetric channel is achievable by using a linear or a convolutional code. In accordance with this idea, the Slepian-Wolf codes are constructed in [3], [15], [19], [31] from turbo codes [5], polar codes [2], and low density parity check (LDPC) codes [14] with practical decoding algorithms. It should be noted that the correlation of two sources are assumed to be binary-symmetric. It should be noted that codes for an asymmetric channel can be constructed by using the channel-input alphabet extention [4], [13, Sec. 6.2] or polar codes [18].

On the other hand, Cover [8] introduced the random binning method for constructing the Slepian-Wolf code, where conditions such as symmetric correlations are not assumed for two sources. Following this idea, Csiszár [9] proved that the fundamental limits are achievable by using linear codes. In [24], it is proved that the fundamental limits are achievable by using LDPC codes. These results are unified by using the 2-universal class of hash functions [6] and its extensions [25], [26]. It should be noted that the use of a typical-set decoder or a maximum-likelihood decoder is assumed in these results.

Based on the concept of hash functions, in this paper we adopt an approach where we construct a channel code from a source code with decoder side information, which is a kind of Slepian-Wolf code. A similar approach is investigated in the context of the linear codebook-level duality of channel codes and the Slepian-Wolf codes [7], where the symmetric correlation of two sources (channel input and output) is assumed. This paper does not assume such correlations. It should be noted that this approach is investigated in [22],



Fig. 1. Source Coding with Decoder Side Information: An encoder sends a codeword $A\boldsymbol{x}$ obtained from a source output $\boldsymbol{x}$ by using an encoding function A. A decoder reproduces $\boldsymbol{x}$ from the codeword and side information $\boldsymbol{y}$ by using a decoding function $\boldsymbol{x}_A$.



Fig. 2. Channel Coding: An encoder sends a codeword $\boldsymbol{x}$ obtained from a message $\boldsymbol{m}$ by using an encoding function φ. A decoder receives an output $\boldsymbol{y}$ of a channel $\boldsymbol{W}$ and reproduces $\boldsymbol{m}$ from $\boldsymbol{y}$ by using a decoding function ψ.

J. Muramatsu is with NTT Communication Science Laboratories, NTT Corporation, 2-4, Hikaridai, Seika-cho, Soraku-gun, Kyoto 619-0237, Japan (E-mail: muramatsu.jun@lab.ntt.co.jp).

[25], [29], [36], where these papers prove that there is a pair consisting of a source code with decoder side information and a encoding map to construct a channel code. However, a maximal-likelihood decoder is assumed, and it is unknown whether for an arbitrary given source code with decoder side information there is a good encoding map with which to construct a channel code. In [24], it is proved by assuming a stationary memoryless condition that for a given arbitrary linear source code with decoder side information there is a good encoding map with which to construct a channel code, where the encoding map is intractable. In contrast, this paper introduces a tractable encoding map by using a constrained-random-number generator [29]. We can use *any* source code with decoder side information, where it is confirmed theoretically or empirically that the decoding error probability is small. It should be noted that neither a typical-set decoder nor a maximal-likelihood decoder is assumed for the source code with decoder side information. Our result suggests that we can divide channel coding problem into the problems of channel encoding and source decoding with side information.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce the construction of a channel code by using an arbitrary source code with decoder side information. Based on the results in Section II, Section III revisits the channel code using the constrained-random-number generator introduced in [29].

II. Channel Code by Using Source Code with Decoder Side Information

In this section, we construct a channel code by using a source code with decoder side information. To this end, we review a balanced-coloring property [30], which is a variant of the hash property introduced in [25], [27], [28], [29].

A. $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$-Balanced-Coloring Property

Throughout this paper, we use the following definitions and notations. The complement of $\mathcal{U}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{U}^c$ and the set difference is defined as $\mathcal{U}\setminus\mathcal{V} \equiv \mathcal{U}\cap\mathcal{V}^c$. Let $B\boldsymbol{x}$ denote a value taken by a function B at $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n$, where B may be nonlinear. When B is a linear function expressed by an $l\times n$ matrix, we assume that $\mathcal{X}\equiv \mathrm{GF}(q)$ is a finite field and the range of functions is $\mathcal{X}^l$. For a function B and a set $\mathcal{B}$ of functions, let $\mathrm{Im}B$ and $\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}$ be defined as

$$\mathrm{Im}B \equiv \{B\boldsymbol{x} : \boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n\}$$
$$\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B} \equiv \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{B}} \mathrm{Im}B.$$

We define a set $\mathcal{C}_B(\boldsymbol{m})$ as

$$\mathcal{C}_B(\boldsymbol{m}) \equiv \{\boldsymbol{x} : B\boldsymbol{x}=\boldsymbol{m}\}.$$

The random variables of a function B and a vector $\boldsymbol{c}$ are denoted by the sans serif letters B and $\mathbf{c}$, respectively. It should be noted that the random variable of an n-dimensional vector $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n$ is denoted by the Roman letter X^n that does not represent a function, which is the way it has been used so far. The symbol E denotes the expectation. For example, $E_{\mathsf{Bc}}[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation with respect to random variables B and $\mathbf{c}$.

Here, we introduce the balanced-coloring property for an ensemble of functions. It requires weaker conditions than the hash property introduced in [27], [28], [29].

Definition 1 ([30]): Let $\mathcal{B}_n$ be a set of functions on $\mathcal{X}^n$ and $p_{\mathsf{B},n}$ be a probability distribution on $\mathcal{B}_n$. We call a pair $(\mathcal{B}_n, p_{\mathsf{B},n})$ an *ensemble*. Then a sequence $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}, \boldsymbol{p}_{\mathsf{B}}) \equiv \{(\mathcal{B}_n, p_{\mathsf{B},n})\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ has an $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathsf{B}}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathsf{B}})$-*balanced-coloring property* if there are two sequences $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathsf{B}} \equiv \{\alpha_{\mathsf{B}}(n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathsf{B}} \equiv \{\beta_{\mathsf{B}}(n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, depending on $\{p_{\mathsf{B},n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \alpha_{\mathsf{B}}(n) = 1 \tag{BC1}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log(\beta_{\mathsf{B}}(n)+1) = 0 \tag{BC2}$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{x}'\in\mathcal{X}^n\setminus\{\boldsymbol{x}\}:\\ p_{\mathsf{B},n}(\{B:B\boldsymbol{x}=B\boldsymbol{x}'\})>\frac{\alpha_{\mathsf{B}}(n)}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}_n|}}} p_{\mathsf{B},n}\left(\{B : B\boldsymbol{x}=B\boldsymbol{x}'\}\right) \le \beta_{\mathsf{B}}(n) \tag{BC3}$$

for all sufficiently large[1] n and all $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n$. Throughout this paper, we omit the dependence of $\mathcal{B}$, p_{B}, α_{B} and β_{B} on n.

Here, let us introduce examples of ensembles satisfying the balanced-coloring property. When $\mathcal{B}$ is a two-universal class of hash functions [6] and p_{B} is the uniform distribution on $\mathcal{B}$, then $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}, \boldsymbol{p}_{\mathsf{B}})$ has a $(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{0})$-hash property, where $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{0}$ denote the constant sequences of 1 and 0, respectively. Random binning [8] and a set of all linear functions [9] are examples of the two-universal class of hash functions. It is proved in [30] that an ensemble of $l\times n$ systematic sparse matrices has a balanced-coloring property, where a matrix has an $l\times l$ identity sub-matrix.

The following lemma is an extension of the leftover hash lemma [20], the balanced-coloring lemma [1, Lemma 3.1], [10, Lemma 17.3], and the output statistics of random binning [36]. This lemma implies that there is a function B such that $\mathcal{T}$ is almost equally partitioned by B with respect to a measure Q.

Lemma 1 ([28, Lemma 4], [29, Lemma 5]): If $(\mathcal{B}, p_{\mathsf{B}})$ satisfies (BC3), then

$$E_{\mathsf{B}}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}}\left|\frac{Q\left(\mathcal{T}\cap\mathcal{C}_{\mathsf{B}}(\boldsymbol{m})\right)}{Q(\mathcal{T})} - \frac{1}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|}\right|\right] \le \sqrt{\alpha_{\mathsf{B}} - 1 + \frac{[\beta_{\mathsf{B}}+1]|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|\max_{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{T}}Q(\boldsymbol{u})}{Q(\mathcal{T})}}$$

for any function $Q:\mathcal{X}^n\to[0,\infty)$ and $\mathcal{T}\subset\mathcal{X}^n$, where

$$Q(\mathcal{T}) \equiv \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{T}} Q(\boldsymbol{x}).$$

B. Construction of Channel Code

This section introduces a channel code. The idea for the construction is drawn from [24], [25], [28]. We assume that the channel input alphabet $\mathcal{X}^n$ is a finite set but allow the channel output alphabet $\mathcal{Y}^n$ to be an arbitrary (infinite, continuous) set.

[1] In [30], an ensemble is required to satisfy (BC3) for all n and all $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n$. However, it is sufficient to assume that an ensemble satisfies (BC3) for sufficiently large n and all $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n$ because we finally let $n\to\infty$.

We assume that the channel distribution $\mu_{Y^n|X^n}$ and the input distribution μ_{X^n} are given. Let $\mu_{X^n|Y^n}$ be defined as

$$\mu_{X^n|Y^n}(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y}) \equiv \frac{\mu_{Y^n|X^n}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x})\mu_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}} \mu_{Y^n|X^n}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x})\mu_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})}.$$

Here, we assume that an arbitrary fixed-length source code $(A, \boldsymbol{x}_A)$ with decoder side information (Fig. 1) is given, where $A : \mathcal{X}^n \to \mathrm{Im}A$ is the encoding function and $\boldsymbol{x}_A : \mathrm{Im}A \times \mathcal{Y}^n \to \mathcal{X}^n$ is the decoding function. Then the coding rate r of the code is given as

$$r \equiv \frac{1}{n}\log|\mathrm{Im}A|. \tag{1}$$

The decoding error probability $\mathrm{Error}(A)$ of this code is given as

$$\mathrm{Error}(A) \equiv \mu_{X^nY^n}\left(\{(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) : \boldsymbol{x}_A(A\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y}) \neq \boldsymbol{x}\}\right). \tag{2}$$

It should be noted that the condition $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathrm{Error}(A) = 0$ is not assumed for this code, and this code may be sub-optimal in the sense that the coding rate r is not close to the fundamental limit described as the conditional spectral sup-entropy rate $\overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y})$.

For a given $R > 0$, let $(\mathcal{B}, p_{\mathsf{B}})$ be an ensemble of functions on the set $\mathcal{X}^n$ satisfying

$$R = \frac{1}{n}\log|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|, \tag{3}$$

where we define $\mathcal{M}_n \equiv \mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}$ and R represents the rate of the code. We obtain a function $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and a vector $\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathrm{Im}A$ generated at random subject to the distribution p_{B} and $\{\mu_{X^n}(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c}))\}_{\boldsymbol{c}\in\mathrm{Im}A}$, respectively. It should be noted that we can obtain $\boldsymbol{c} \equiv A\boldsymbol{x}$ generated at random subject to the distribution $\{\mu_{X^n}(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c}))\}_{\boldsymbol{c}\in\mathrm{Im}A}$ by generating $\boldsymbol{x}$ at random subject to the distribution μ_{X^n} and operating A.

We fix B and $\boldsymbol{c}$ so that they are shared by the channel encoder and the channel decoder. To summarize, the channel encoder has functions A, B and a vector $\boldsymbol{c}$, and the channel decoder has functions $\boldsymbol{x}_A$, B, and a vector $\boldsymbol{c}$.

We use a constrained-random-number generator to construct a stochastic encoder. Let $\widetilde{X}^n \equiv \widetilde{X}^n_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m})$ be a random variable corresponding to the distribution

$$\nu_{\widetilde{X}^n|M_n}(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{m}) \equiv \begin{cases} \frac{\mu_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\mu_{X^n}(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}))}, & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}), \\ 0, & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x} \notin \mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}), \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}) \equiv \mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c}) \cap \mathcal{C}_B(\boldsymbol{m})$ and the encoder generates $\boldsymbol{x}$ that satisfies $A\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{c}$ and $B\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{m}$ with probability $\nu_{\widetilde{X}^n|M_n}(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{m})$. It should be noted that we can use the sum-product algorithm or the Markov-Chain-Monte-Carlo method to implement the constrained-random-number generator [29], [30]. We define the stochastic channel encoder $\Phi_n : \mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{X}^n$ as

$$\Phi_n(\boldsymbol{m}) \equiv \begin{cases} \widetilde{X}^n_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}), & \text{if } \mu_{X^n}(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m})) > 0, \\ \text{“error,”} & \text{if } \mu_{X^n}(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m})) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n$ be a channel output. We define the channel decoder $\psi_n : \mathcal{Y}^n \to \mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}$ as

$$\psi_n(\boldsymbol{y}) \equiv B\boldsymbol{x}_A(\boldsymbol{c}|\boldsymbol{y}),$$



Fig. 3. Construction of Channel Code

where the decoder reproduces $\boldsymbol{x}$ that satisfies $A\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{c}$ by using $\boldsymbol{x}_A$ and obtains a reproduced message $\boldsymbol{m} = B\boldsymbol{x}$. The flow of vectors is illustrated in Fig. 3.

The error probability $\mathrm{Error}(B,\boldsymbol{c})$ is given by

$$\mathrm{Error}(B,\boldsymbol{c}) \equiv \sum_{\boldsymbol{m}:\mu_{X^n}(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}))=0} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_n|} + \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}: \\ \mu_{X^n}(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}))>0 \\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}) \\ \psi_n(\boldsymbol{y})\neq\boldsymbol{m}}} \frac{\mu_{Y^n|X^n}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x})\mu_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x})}{|\mathcal{M}_n|\mu_{X^n}(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}))}.$$

We have the following theorem, where the proof is given in Section IV-A.

Theorem 1: Let $(A, \boldsymbol{x}_A)$ be a source code with decoder side information, where the encoding rate and the decoding error probability are given by (1) and (2), respectively. Assume that an ensemble $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}, \boldsymbol{p}_{\mathsf{B}})$ has an $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathsf{B}}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathsf{B}})$-balanced-coloring property for a given R satisfying (3) and

$$r + R < \underline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}), \tag{4}$$

where $\underline{H}(\boldsymbol{X})$ is the spectral inf-entropy rate. Then for any $\delta > 0$ and all sufficiently large n there is a function $B \in \mathcal{B}$, and a vector $\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\mathrm{Error}(B,\boldsymbol{c}) \leq \mathrm{Error}(A) + \delta. \tag{5}$$

Let $C(\boldsymbol{W})$ be the channel capacity derived in [34] as

$$C(\boldsymbol{W}) = \sup_{\boldsymbol{X}} \underline{I}(\boldsymbol{X};\boldsymbol{Y}),$$

where $\underline{I}(\boldsymbol{X};\boldsymbol{Y})$ is the spectral inf-mutual information rate and the supremum is taken over all general sources $\boldsymbol{X} = \{X^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and the joint distribution $\mu_{X^nY^n}$ is given as

$$\mu_{X^nY^n}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \equiv \mu_{Y^n|X^n}(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x})\mu_{X^n}(\boldsymbol{x}). \tag{6}$$

It is is shown in [29] that

$$C(\boldsymbol{W}) = \sup_{\boldsymbol{X}} \left[\underline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}) - \overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y})\right] \tag{7}$$

for a general channel $\boldsymbol{W}$, where the supremum is taken over all general sources $\boldsymbol{X}$ and the joint distribution of $(\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{Y})$ is given by (6). From the above theorem and (7), the channel capacity is achievable with the proposed code by letting $\boldsymbol{X}$ be a source that attains the supremum on the right hand side of (7), $R \to \underline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}) - \overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y})$, $\delta \to 0$, and assuming that $(A, \boldsymbol{x}_A)$ is optimum in the sense that $r \to \overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y})$ and $\mathrm{Error}(A) \to 0$.

III. Channel Code Using Constrained-Random-Number Generator Revisited

In this section, we revisit the channel code using the constrained-random-number generator introduced in [29]. To this end, we introduce a variant of the hash property [25], [29] and a construction of source code with decoder side information based on this property.

A. $(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta})$-Collision-Resistance Property

In this section, we revisit [25, Remark 1], which mentions that some ensembles of sparse matrices satisfy the weaker condition $\lim_{n\to\infty}[1/n]\log\alpha_A(n) = 0$. We introduce the collision-resistance property as follows.

Definition 2: Let $\mathcal{A}_n$ be a set of functions on $\mathcal{X}^n$ and $p_{\mathsf{A},n}$ be a probability distribution on $\mathcal{A}_n$. Then a sequence $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}},\boldsymbol{p}_{\mathsf{A}}) \equiv \{(\mathcal{A}_n, p_{\mathsf{A},n})\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ has an $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathsf{A}},\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathsf{A}})$-*collision-resistance property* if there are two sequences $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathsf{A}} \equiv \{\alpha_{\mathsf{A}}(n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathsf{A}} \equiv \{\beta_{\mathsf{A}}(n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, depending on $\{p_{\mathsf{A},n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\alpha_{\mathsf{A}}(n) = 0 \tag{CR1}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\beta_{\mathsf{A}}(n) = 0 \tag{CR2}$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{x}'\in\mathcal{X}^n\setminus\{\boldsymbol{x}\}:\\ p_{\mathsf{A},n}(\{A:A\boldsymbol{x}=A\boldsymbol{x}'\})>\frac{\alpha_{\mathsf{A}}(n)}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}_n|}}} p_{\mathsf{A},n}\left(\{A : A\boldsymbol{x} = A\boldsymbol{x}'\}\right) \le \beta_{\mathsf{A}}(n) \tag{CR3}$$

for all sufficiently large n and all $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n$, where (CR3) is the same as (BC3).

It should be noted that when $\mathcal{A}$ is a two-universal class of hash functions [6] and p_{A} is the uniform distribution on $\mathcal{A}$, then $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}},\boldsymbol{p}_{\mathsf{A}})$ also has a $(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{0})$-collision-resistance property. Random binning [8] and a set of all linear functions [9] are examples of the two-universal class of hash functions. The motivation for introducing the collision-resistance property is that we can include the expurgated ensemble of linear functions introduced in the next section.

The following lemma is related to the *collision-resistance property*, that is, if the number of bins is greater than the number of items then there is an assignment such that every bin contains at most one item.

Lemma 2 ([25, Lemma 1][29, Lemma 4]): If $(\mathcal{A}, p_{\mathsf{A}})$ satisfies (CR3), then

$$p_{\mathsf{A}}\left(\{A : [\mathcal{G}\setminus\{\boldsymbol{u}\}]\cap\mathcal{C}_A(A\boldsymbol{u}) \neq \emptyset\}\right) \le \frac{|\mathcal{G}|\alpha_{\mathsf{A}}}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}|} + \beta_{\mathsf{A}}$$

for all $\mathcal{G}\subset\mathcal{U}^n$ and $\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathcal{U}^n$.

B. Expurgated Ensemble of Linear Functions

In this section, we consider the expurgated ensemble of linear functions. The idea comes from [4], [12], [14], [21].

Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a finite field and $\mathcal{A}$ be a set of linear functions $A : \mathcal{X}^n \to \mathcal{X}^l$, where A can be expressed by an $l\times n$ matrix. Let $\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})$ be the type of $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{U}^n$, which is characterized by the empirical probability distribution of the sequence $\boldsymbol{x}$. For a type $\boldsymbol{t}$, let $\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ be defined as

$$\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{t}} \equiv \{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n : \boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{t}\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a set of all types of length n except $\boldsymbol{t}(\mathbf{0})$, where $\mathbf{0}$ is the zero vector. For a probability distribution p_{A} on a set of $l\times n$ matrices and a type $\boldsymbol{t}$, let $S(p_{\mathsf{A}},\boldsymbol{t})$ be defined as

$$\begin{aligned} S(p_{\mathsf{A}},\boldsymbol{t}) &\equiv \sum_{A\in\mathcal{A}} p_{\mathsf{A}}(A)|\{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n : A\boldsymbol{x}=\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})=\boldsymbol{t}\}| \\ &= \sum_{A\in\mathcal{A}} p_{\mathsf{A}}(A)|\mathcal{C}_A(\mathbf{0})\cap\mathcal{C}_{\boldsymbol{t}}|, \end{aligned}$$

which is the expected number of codewords that have type $\boldsymbol{t}$. For a given $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}\subset\mathcal{H}$, we define $\alpha_{\mathsf{A}}(n)$ and $\beta_{\mathsf{A}}(n)$ as

$$\alpha_{\mathsf{A}}(n) \equiv \frac{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}|}{|\mathcal{X}|^l}\cdot\max_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\widehat{\mathcal{H}}}\frac{S(p_{\mathsf{A}},\boldsymbol{t})}{S(p_{\overline{\mathsf{A}}},\boldsymbol{t})} \tag{8}$$

$$\beta_{\mathsf{A}}(n) \equiv \sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{H}}} S(p_{\mathsf{A}},\boldsymbol{t}), \tag{9}$$

where $p_{\overline{\mathsf{A}}}$ denotes the uniform distribution on the set of all $l\times n$ matrices.

For an ensemble $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}},\boldsymbol{p}_{\mathsf{A}})$ of linear functions, we define an expurgated ensemble $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{p}}_{\mathsf{A}})$ as

$$\widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}}(A) \equiv \begin{cases} \frac{p_{\mathsf{A}}(A)}{p_{\mathsf{A}}\left(\left\{A:\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})\in\widehat{\mathcal{H}}\cup\{\boldsymbol{t}(\mathbf{0})\}\ \text{for all}\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_A(\mathbf{0})\right\}\right)} \\ \qquad \text{if } \boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})\in\widehat{\mathcal{H}}\cup\{\boldsymbol{t}(\mathbf{0})\} \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_A(\mathbf{0}), \\ 0 \quad \text{if } \exists\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_A(\mathbf{0}) \text{ s.t. } \boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{H}}, \end{cases}$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ will be specified later. It should be noted that $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ is usually defined as the set of $\boldsymbol{t}$ satisfying the requirement that the weight (the number of non-zero symbols) is greater than γn, where γ depends only on $|\mathcal{X}|$ and l. Then the condition $\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})\in\widehat{\mathcal{H}}\cup\{\boldsymbol{t}(\mathbf{0})\}$ for all $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_A(\mathbf{0})$ implies that the minimum distance of A (the minimum Hamming distance between two different vectors in $\mathcal{C}_A(\mathbf{0})$) is greater than γn. That is, the ensemble $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{p}}_{\mathsf{A}})$ is obtained from $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}},\boldsymbol{p}_{\mathsf{A}})$ by expurgating functions with the minimum distance smaller than γn.

We have the following lemma, where the proof is given in Section IV-B.

Lemma 3: We first assume that for an ensemble $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}},\boldsymbol{p}_{\mathsf{A}})$ of linear functions there is $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ such that a pair α_{A} and β_{A} defined by (8) and (9), respectively, satisfy

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\alpha_{\mathsf{A}}(n) = 0 \tag{10}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\frac{1}{1-\beta_{\mathsf{A}}(n)} = 0, \tag{11}$$

where (11) implicitly assumes that $\beta_{\mathsf{A}} < 1$ for all sufficiently large n. Then the expurgated ensemble $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{p}}_{\mathsf{A}})$

satisfies the $(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\mathsf{A}}, \mathbf{0})$-collision-resistance property, where $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\mathsf{A}} \equiv \{\widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathsf{A}}(n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is given as

$$\widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathsf{A}}(n) \equiv \frac{\alpha_{\mathsf{A}}(n)}{1-\beta_{\mathsf{A}}(n)}.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}}\left(\{A : [\mathcal{G} \setminus \{\boldsymbol{x}\}] \cap \mathcal{C}_A(A\boldsymbol{x}) \neq \emptyset\}\right) \leq \frac{|\mathcal{G}|\alpha_{\mathsf{A}}}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}|[1-\beta_{\mathsf{A}}]} \quad (12)$$

for all sufficiently large n, all $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{X}^n$, and all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$.

C. Source Code with Decoder Side Information

Here, we consider the source coding with decoder side information illustrated in Fig. 1. The fundamental limit for this problem is given as the conditional spectral sup-entropy rate $\overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y})$ [23].

The achievability of this problem is proved via the Slepian-Wolf theorem using random binning [8], [23] or the ensemble of all q-ary linear matrices [9]. The construction of an encoders using sparse matrix is studied in [31], [33] and the achievability is proved in [24], [26] by using a maximum-likelihood or minimum-divergence decoding. We obtain the coding theorem based on the collision-resistance property as a corollary of [25, Theorem 7] for stationary memoryless sources.

We fix a function $A : \mathcal{X}^n \to \mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}$ which is used as a encoding function. The encoding rate r is given as

$$r = \frac{\log|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}|}{n}. \quad (13)$$

We define the maximum-likelihood decoder $\boldsymbol{x}_A : \mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{Y}^n \to \mathcal{X}^n$ as

$$\boldsymbol{x}_A(\boldsymbol{c}|\boldsymbol{y}) \equiv \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})} \mu_{X^n|Y^n}(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y}).$$

The decoding error probability $\mathrm{Error}(A)$ is given as

$$\mathrm{Error}(A) \equiv \mu_{X^nY^n}\left(\{(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) : \boldsymbol{x}_A(A\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y}) \neq \boldsymbol{x}\}\right).$$

It should be noted that the construction is analogous to the coset encoding/decoding when A is a linear function.

We have the following theorem. It should be noted that $\mathcal{Y}$ is allowed to be an infinite/continuous set and the correlation of the two sources is allowed to be asymmetric.

Theorem 2: Let $(\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{Y})$ be a pair of correlated general sources. Assume that an ensemble $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}, \boldsymbol{p}_{\mathsf{A}})$ has an $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathsf{A}}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathsf{A}})$-collision-resistance property for a given r satisfying (13) and

$$r > \overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y}). \quad (14)$$

Then for any $\delta > 0$ and all sufficiently large n there is a function (sparse matrix) $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\mathrm{Error}(A) \leq \delta.$$

It should be noted that the theorem is implicitly proved in [29, Eq. (58)] from Lemma 2. The proof is given in Section IV-C for the completeness of the paper.

D. Channel Code Using Constrained-Random-Number Generator

From Theorems 1 and 2, we have the following corollary, which is an improvement of [29, Theorem 1]. It should be noted that the conditions for ensembles $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}, \boldsymbol{p}_{\mathsf{A}})$ and $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}, \boldsymbol{p}_{\mathsf{B}})$ are weaker than those in [29, Theorem 1].

Corollary 3: Assume that ensembles $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}, \boldsymbol{p}_{\mathsf{A}})$ and $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}, \boldsymbol{p}_{\mathsf{B}})$ have an $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathsf{A}}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathsf{A}})$-collision-resistance property and an $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathsf{B}}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathsf{B}})$-balanced-coloring property, respectively, for given r and R satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} r &= \frac{1}{n}\log|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}| \\ R &= \frac{1}{n}\log|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}| \\ r &> \overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y}) \\ r+R &< \underline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}). \end{aligned}$$

Then for any $\delta > 0$ and all sufficiently large n there are functions $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $B \in \mathcal{B}$, and a vector $\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}$ such that the decoding error probability is less than δ. The channel capacity is achievable with the proposed code by letting $\boldsymbol{X}$ be a source that attains the supremum on the right hand side of (7).

IV. Proofs of Theorems

In the following proofs, we omit the dependence on n of X and Y when they appear in the subscripts of μ, $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$, and $\underline{\mathcal{T}}$. The integral over the alphabet $\mathcal{Y}^n$ is denoted by $\sum$. We define $\chi(\cdot)$ as

$$\chi(\text{statement}) \equiv \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the statement is true} \\ 0, & \text{if the statement is false.} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

A. Proof of Theorem 1

From (4), we have the fact that there is $\varepsilon > 0$ satisfying

$$r + R < \underline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}) - \varepsilon. \quad (16)$$

Let $\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X \subset \mathcal{X}^n$ be defined as

$$\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X \equiv \left\{\boldsymbol{x} : \frac{1}{n}\log\frac{1}{\mu_X(\boldsymbol{x})} \geq \underline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}) - \varepsilon\right\}.$$

For all A, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{\mathsf{Bc}}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}}\left|\frac{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{m}))}{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\mathbf{c}))} - \frac{1}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|}\right|\right] \\ &= E_{\mathsf{B}}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{c}}\left|\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m})) - \frac{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c}))}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|}\right|\right] \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\le E_{\mathsf{B}}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{c}}\left|\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{m})\cap\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)-\frac{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|}\right|\right]\\
&\quad+E_{\mathsf{B}}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{c}}|\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{m})\cap[\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X]^c)|\right]\\
&\quad+E_{\mathsf{B}}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{c}}\left|-\frac{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap[\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X]^c)}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|}\right|\right]\\
&=E_{\mathsf{B}}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{c}}\left|\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m})\cap\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)-\frac{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|}\right|\right]\\
&\quad+E_{\mathsf{B}}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{c}}\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m})\cap[\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X]^c)\right]\\
&\quad+E_{\mathsf{B}}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{c}}\frac{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap[\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X]^c)}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|}\right],
\end{aligned}
\tag{17}
$$

where the first equality comes from the fact that the distribution of the random variable $\mathbf{c}$ is $\{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c}))\}_{\boldsymbol{c}\in\mathrm{Im}A}$, the first inequality comes from the triangular inequality and the fact that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}))&=\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m})\cap\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)\\
&\quad+\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m})\cap[\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X]^c)\\
\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c}))&=\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)+\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap[\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X]^c),
\end{aligned}
$$

and the second equality comes from the fact that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m})\cap[\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X]^c)&\ge 0\\
\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap[\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X]^c)&\ge 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\{C_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m})\}_{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}}$ and $\{C_A(\boldsymbol{c})\}_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ form a partition, the second and the third terms on the right hand side of (17) are evaluated as

$$
E_{\mathsf{B}}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{c}}\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m})\cap[\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X]^c)\right]=\mu_X([\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X]^c)\tag{18}
$$

$$
E_{\mathsf{B}}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{c}}\frac{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap[\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X]^c)}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|}\right]=\mu_X([\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X]^c).\tag{19}
$$

On the other hand, the first term on the right hand side of (17) is evaluated as (20), which appears on the next page, where the fist inequality comes from Lemma 1 and the fact that

$$
\mu_X(\boldsymbol{x})\le 2^{-n[\underline{H}(\boldsymbol{X})-\varepsilon]}
$$

for all $\boldsymbol{x}\in\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X$, the second inequality comes from the Jensen inequality, and the last inequality comes from (1), (3), and the fact that $\mu_X(\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)\le 1$. Then we have (21), which appears on the next page, where the first inequality comes from the fact that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E_{\mathsf{Bc}}\left[\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}:\\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{m})\\ \boldsymbol{x}_A(\mathbf{c}|\boldsymbol{y})\neq\boldsymbol{x}}}\frac{\mu_{XY}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})}{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c}))}\right]\\
&=E_{\mathsf{B}}\left[\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}:\\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{m})\\ \boldsymbol{x}_A(A\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y})\neq\boldsymbol{x}}}\mu_{XY}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\right]\\
&=\sum_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}}\mu_{XY}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\chi(\boldsymbol{x}_A(A\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y})\neq\boldsymbol{x})
\end{aligned}
\tag{22}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}:\\ \mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}))>0\\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m})}}\mu_{XY}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\\
&\quad\cdot\left[\frac{1}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}))}-\frac{1}{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c}))}\right]\\
&\le\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{m}:\\ \mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}))>0}}\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}))\\
&\quad\cdot\left|\frac{1}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}))}-\frac{1}{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c}))}\right|\\
&=\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{m}:\\ \mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}))>0}}\left|\frac{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}))}{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c}))}-\frac{1}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|}\right|\\
&=\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}}\left|\frac{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}))}{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c}))}-\frac{1}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|}\right|-\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{m}:\\ \mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m}))=0}}\frac{1}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|},
\end{aligned}
\tag{23}
$$

and the second inequality comes from (2) and (17)–(20). From (BC1), (BC2), (16), (21), and the fact that $\mu_X([\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X]^c)\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$, we have the fact that there is a pair consisting of a function $B\in\mathcal{B}$ and a vector $\boldsymbol{c}\in\mathrm{Im}A$ that satisfy (5). ■

B. Proof of Lemma 3

Since $p_{\mathsf{A}}\left(\left\{A:\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})\in\widehat{\mathcal{H}}\cup\{\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{0})\}\text{ for all }\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{0})\right\}\right)$ depends only on $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ and $p_{\mathsf{A}}(\{A:A\boldsymbol{x}=\boldsymbol{0}\})$ depends on $\boldsymbol{x}$ only through the type $\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})$, we have the fact that $\widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}}(\{A:A\boldsymbol{x}=\boldsymbol{0}\})$ also depends on $\boldsymbol{x}$ only through the type $\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})$. We use the following lemma.

Lemma 4 ([26, Theorem 1][29, Lemma 6]): Let $(\mathcal{A},p_{\mathsf{A}})$ be an ensemble of matrices. We assume that $p_{\mathsf{A}}(\{A:A\boldsymbol{x}=\boldsymbol{0}\})$ depends on $\boldsymbol{x}$ only through the type $\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})$. Let $(\alpha_{\mathsf{A}},\beta_{\mathsf{A}})$ be defined by (8) and (9). Then $(\mathcal{A},p_{\mathsf{A}})$ satisfies (CR3).

Now, we prove the lemma. Let $\chi(\cdot)$ be defined by (15). From the fact that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&p_{\mathsf{A}}\left(\left\{A:\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})\in\widehat{\mathcal{H}}\cup\{\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{0})\}\text{ for all }\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{0})\right\}\right)\\
&=1-p_{\mathsf{A}}\left(\left\{A:\exists\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{0})\text{ s.t. }\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{H}}\right\}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E_{\mathsf{B}}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{c}}\left|\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\boldsymbol{c},\boldsymbol{m})\cap\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)-\frac{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|}\right|\right]\\
&=\sum_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)E_{\mathsf{B}}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}}\left|\frac{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{\mathsf{B}}(\boldsymbol{m})\cap\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)}{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)}-\frac{1}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|}\right|\right]\\
&\le\sum_{\boldsymbol{c}}\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)\sqrt{\alpha_{\mathsf{B}}-1+\frac{[\beta_{\mathsf{B}}+1]|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|2^{-n[\underline{H}(\boldsymbol{X})-\varepsilon]}}{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)}}\\
&\le\mu_X(\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)\sqrt{\sum_{\boldsymbol{c}}\frac{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)}{\mu_X(\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)}\left[\alpha_{\mathsf{B}}-1+\frac{[\beta_{\mathsf{B}}+1]|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|2^{-n[\underline{H}(\boldsymbol{X})-\varepsilon]}}{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c})\cap\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)}\right]}\\
&=\mu_X(\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)\sqrt{\alpha_{\mathsf{B}}-1+\frac{[\beta_{\mathsf{B}}+1]|\mathrm{Im}A||\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|2^{-n[\underline{H}(\boldsymbol{X})-\varepsilon]}}{\mu_X(\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X)}}\\
&\le\sqrt{\alpha_{\mathsf{B}}-1+[\beta_{\mathsf{B}}+1]2^{-n[\underline{H}(\boldsymbol{X})-r-R-\varepsilon]}}
\end{aligned}
\tag{20}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E_{\mathsf{Bc}}\left[\mathrm{Error}(\mathsf{B},\mathbf{c})\right]\\
&=E_{\mathsf{Bc}}\left[\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{m}:\\ \mu_{X^n}(\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{m}))=0}}\frac{1}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|}+\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}:\\ \mu_{X^n}(\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{m}))>0\\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{m})\\ \boldsymbol{x}_A(\mathbf{c}|\boldsymbol{y})\neq\boldsymbol{x}}}\frac{\mu_{XY}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{m}))}\right]\\
&=E_{\mathsf{Bc}}\left[\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{m}:\\ \mu_{X^n}(\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{m}))=0}}\frac{1}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|}+\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{m},\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}:\\ \mu_{X^n}(\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{m}))>0\\ \boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{m})\\ \boldsymbol{x}_A(\mathbf{c}|\boldsymbol{y})\neq\boldsymbol{x}}}\mu_{XY}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\left[\frac{1}{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c}))}+\frac{1}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{m}))}-\frac{1}{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c}))}\right]\right]\\
&\le\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}:\\ \boldsymbol{x}_A(A\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y})\neq\boldsymbol{x}}}\mu_{XY}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})+E_{\mathsf{Bc}}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{m}}\left|\frac{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_{A\mathsf{B}}(\mathbf{c},\boldsymbol{m}))}{\mu_X(\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{c}))}-\frac{1}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{B}|}\right|\right]\\
&\le\mathrm{Error}(A)+\sqrt{\alpha_{\mathsf{B}}-1+[\beta_{\mathsf{B}}+1]2^{-n[\underline{H}(\boldsymbol{X})-r-R-\varepsilon]}}+2\mu_X([\underline{\mathcal{T}}_X]^c)
\end{aligned}
\tag{21}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\ge 1-\sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{H}}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}}p_{\mathsf{A}}\left(\{A:A\boldsymbol{x}=\boldsymbol{0},\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})=\boldsymbol{t}\}\right)\\
&=1-\sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{H}}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}}\sum_{A}p_{\mathsf{A}}(A)\chi(A\boldsymbol{x}=\boldsymbol{0},\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})=\boldsymbol{t})\\
&=1-\sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{H}}}\sum_{A}p_{\mathsf{A}}(A)\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}}\chi(A\boldsymbol{x}=\boldsymbol{0},\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})=\boldsymbol{t})\\
&=1-\sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{H}}}\sum_{A}p_{\mathsf{A}}(A)|\{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n:A\boldsymbol{x}=\boldsymbol{0},\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})=\boldsymbol{t}\}|\\
&=1-\sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{H}}}S(p_{\mathsf{A}},\boldsymbol{t})\\
&=1-\beta_{\mathsf{A}},
\end{aligned}
\tag{24}
$$

we have

$$
\frac{1}{p_{\mathsf{A}}\left(\left\{A:\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})\in\widehat{\mathcal{H}}\cup\{\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{0})\}\text{ for all }\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{0})\right\}\right)}\le\frac{1}{1-\beta_{\mathsf{A}}}
$$

for all sufficiently large n satisfying $\beta_{\mathsf{A}}<1$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}}(A)&\le\frac{p_{\mathsf{A}}(A)}{p_{\mathsf{A}}\left(\left\{A:\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})\in\widehat{\mathcal{H}}\cup\{\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{0})\}\text{ for all }\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{0})\right\}\right)}\\
&\le\frac{p_{\mathsf{A}}(A)}{1-\beta_{\mathsf{A}}}
\end{aligned}
\tag{25}
$$

for all A and all sufficiently large n. Let $\widetilde{\alpha}^*_{\mathsf{A}}$ be defined as

$$
\widetilde{\alpha}^*_{\mathsf{A}}\equiv\frac{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}|}{|\mathcal{X}|^l}\cdot\max_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\widehat{\mathcal{H}}}\frac{S(\widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}},\boldsymbol{t})}{S(p_{\overline{\mathsf{A}}},\boldsymbol{t})}.
$$

Then we have the relation

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\alpha}^*_{\mathsf{A}}&=\frac{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}|}{|\mathcal{X}|^l}\max_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\widehat{\mathcal{H}}}\sum_{A}\frac{\widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}}(A)|\{\boldsymbol{x}:A\boldsymbol{x}=\boldsymbol{0},\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})=\boldsymbol{t}\}|}{S(p_{\overline{\mathsf{A}}},\boldsymbol{t})}\\
&\le\frac{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}|}{|\mathcal{X}|^l}\max_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\widehat{\mathcal{H}}}\sum_{A}\frac{p_{\mathsf{A}}(A)|\{\boldsymbol{x}:A\boldsymbol{x}=\boldsymbol{0},\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})=\boldsymbol{t}\}|}{[1-\beta_{\mathsf{A}}]\,S(p_{\overline{\mathsf{A}}},\boldsymbol{t})}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$= \frac{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}|}{[1-\beta_{\mathsf{A}}]\,|\mathcal{X}|^l} \cdot \max_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\widehat{\mathcal{H}}} \frac{S(p_{\mathsf{A}},\boldsymbol{t})}{S(p_{\overline{\mathsf{A}}},\boldsymbol{t})}$$
$$= \frac{\alpha_{\mathsf{A}}}{1-\beta_{\mathsf{A}}}$$
$$= \widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathsf{A}} \tag{26}$$

for all sufficiently large n, where the inequality comes from (25).

When $\boldsymbol{t} \in \mathcal{H}\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ and $|\{\boldsymbol{x} : A\boldsymbol{x}=\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})=\boldsymbol{t}\}| > 0$, there is $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{C}_A(\boldsymbol{0})$ such that $\boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x}) \in \mathcal{H}\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$. Then, from the definition of $\widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}}$, we have $\widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}}(A)=0$ when $\boldsymbol{t} \in \mathcal{H}\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ and $|\{\boldsymbol{x} : A\boldsymbol{x}=\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})=\boldsymbol{t}\}| > 0$. This implies that

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{H}}} S(\widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}},\boldsymbol{t})$$
$$= \sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{H}}} \sum_{A} \widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}}(A)|\{\boldsymbol{x} : A\boldsymbol{x}=\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{t}(\boldsymbol{x})=\boldsymbol{t}\}|$$
$$= 0. \tag{27}$$

Then we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{x}'\in\mathcal{X}^n\setminus\{\boldsymbol{x}\}:\\ \widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}}(\{A:A\boldsymbol{x}=A\boldsymbol{x}'\})>\frac{\widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathsf{A}}}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}|}}} \widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}}\left(\{A : A\boldsymbol{x}=A\boldsymbol{x}'\}\right)$$
$$\le \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{x}'\in\mathcal{X}^n\setminus\{\boldsymbol{x}\}:\\ \widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}}(\{A:A\boldsymbol{x}=A\boldsymbol{x}'\})>\frac{\widetilde{\alpha}^*_{\mathsf{A}}}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}|}}} \widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}}\left(\{A : A\boldsymbol{x}=A\boldsymbol{x}'\}\right)$$
$$\le \sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{H}}} S(\widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}},\boldsymbol{t})$$
$$= 0 \tag{28}$$

for all sufficiently large n satisfying $\beta_{\mathsf{A}} < 1$, where the first inequality comes from (26), the second inequality is obtained by applying Lemma 4 to the ensemble $(\mathcal{A},\widetilde{p}_{\mathsf{A}})$ and $\widetilde{\alpha}^*_{\mathsf{A}}$, and the equality comes from (27).

We have

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log\widetilde{\alpha}_{\mathsf{A}}(n)$$
$$= \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log\frac{\alpha_{\mathsf{A}}(n)}{1-\beta_{\mathsf{A}}(n)}$$
$$\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log\alpha_{\mathsf{A}}(n) + \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log\frac{1}{1-\beta_{\mathsf{A}}(n)}$$
$$= 0, \tag{29}$$

where the last equality comes from (10) and (11). Then, from (28) and (29), we have the fact that $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{p}}_{\mathsf{A}})$ satisfies the $(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\mathsf{A}},\boldsymbol{0})$-collision-resistance property. Inequality (12) is shown directly by applying Lemma 2 to the ensemble $(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{p}}_{\mathsf{A}})$. ■

C. Proof of Theorem 2

From (14), we have the fact that there is $\varepsilon > 0$ satisfying

$$r > \overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y}) + \varepsilon. \tag{30}$$

Let $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{X|Y} \subset \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n$ be defined as

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{X|Y} \equiv \left\{(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) : \frac{1}{n}\log\frac{1}{\mu_{X|Y}(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y})} \le \overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y}) + \varepsilon\right\}.$$

Assume that $(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_{X|Y}$ and $\boldsymbol{x}_A(A\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y}) \neq \boldsymbol{x}$. Then we have the fact that there is $\boldsymbol{x}' \in \mathcal{C}_A(A\boldsymbol{x})$ such that $\boldsymbol{x}' \neq \boldsymbol{x}$ and

$$\mu_{X|Y}(\boldsymbol{x}'|\boldsymbol{y}) \ge \mu_{X|Y}(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y}) \ge 2^{-n[\overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y})+\varepsilon]}.$$

This implies that $\left[\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{X|Y}(\boldsymbol{y})\setminus\{\boldsymbol{x}\}\right] \cap \mathcal{C}_A(A\boldsymbol{x}) \neq \emptyset$, where $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{X|Y}(\boldsymbol{y}) \equiv \{\boldsymbol{x} : (\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_{X|Y}\}$. We have

$$E_{\mathsf{A}}\left[\chi(\boldsymbol{x}_{\mathsf{A}}(\mathsf{A}\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y}) \neq \boldsymbol{x})\right]$$
$$\le p_{\mathsf{A}}\left(\left\{A : [\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{X|Y}(\boldsymbol{y})\setminus\{\boldsymbol{x}\}] \cap \mathcal{C}_A(A\boldsymbol{x}) \neq \emptyset\right\}\right)$$
$$\le \frac{|\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{X|Y}(\boldsymbol{y})|\alpha_{\mathsf{A}}}{|\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{A}|} + \beta_{\mathsf{A}}$$
$$\le 2^{-n[r-\overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y})-\varepsilon]}\alpha_{\mathsf{A}} + \beta_{\mathsf{A}} \tag{31}$$

for all $(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_{X|Y}$, where $\chi(\cdot)$ is defined by (15), the second inequality comes from Lemma 2, and the third inequality comes from (14) and the fact that $|\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{X|Y}(\boldsymbol{y})| \le 2^{n[\overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y})+\varepsilon]}$.

We have the fact that

$$E_{\mathsf{A}}\left[\mathrm{Error}(\mathsf{A})\right]$$
$$= E_{\mathsf{A}}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}} \mu_{XY}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\chi(\boldsymbol{x}_{\mathsf{A}}(\mathsf{A}\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y}) \neq \boldsymbol{x})\right]$$
$$= \sum_{(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\in\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{X|Y}} \mu_{XY}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})E_{\mathsf{A}}\left[\chi(\boldsymbol{x}_{\mathsf{A}}(\mathsf{A}\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y}) \neq \boldsymbol{x})\right]$$
$$+ \sum_{(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\notin\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{X|Y}} \mu_{XY}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})E_{\mathsf{A}}\left[\chi(\boldsymbol{x}_{\mathsf{A}}(\mathsf{A}\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{y}) \neq \boldsymbol{x})\right]$$
$$\le 2^{-n[r-\overline{H}(\boldsymbol{X}|\boldsymbol{Y})-\varepsilon]}\alpha_{\mathsf{A}} + \beta_{\mathsf{A}} + \mu_{XY}([\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{X|Y}]^c), \tag{32}$$

where the last inequality comes from (31). From (CR1), (CR2), (30) and the fact that $\mu_{XY}([\mathcal{T}_{XY}]^c) \to 0$ as $n\to\infty$, we have the fact that there is a function $A \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfying $\mathrm{Error}(A) \le \delta$ for all $\delta > 0$ and all sufficiently large n. ■

REFERENCES

[1] R. Ahlswede and I. Csiszár, "Common randomness in information theory and cryptography — Part II: CR capacity," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-44, pp. 225–240, Jan. 1998.

[2] E. Arıkan, "Channel polarization: a method for constructing capacity-achieving codes for symmetric binary-input memoryless channels," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-55, no. 7, July 2009.

[3] J. Bajcsy and P. Mitran, "Coding for the Slepian-Wolf problem with turbo codes," *Proc. 2001 IEEE Globecom*, pp. 1400–1404, 2001.

[4] A. Bennatan and D. Burshtein, "On the application of LDPC codes to arbitrary discrete-memoryless channels," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-50, no. 3, pp. 417–438, Mar. 2004.

[5] C. Berrou, A. Glavieux, and P. Thitimajshima, "Near Shannon limit error correcting codes and decoding: turbo codes," *Proc. Int. Conf. Commun.*, Geneva, Switzerland, 1993, pp. 1064–1070.

[6] J. L. Carter and M. N. Wegman, "Universal classes of hash functions," *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, vol. 18, pp. 143–154, 1979.

[7] J. Chen, D.K. He, A. Jagmohan, L. A. Lastras-Montaño, and E.H. Yang, "On the linear codebook-level duality between Slepian-Wolf coding and channel coding," *IEEE Trans. Inform Theory*, vol. IT-55, no. 12, pp. 5575–5590, Dec. 2009.

[8] T. M. Cover, "A proof of the data compression theorem of Slepian and Wolf for ergodic sources," *IEEE Trans. Inform Theory*, vol. IT-21, no. 2, pp. 226–228, Mar. 1975.

[9] I. Csiszár, "Linear codes for sources and source networks: Error exponents, universal coding," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-28, no. 4, pp. 585–592, Jul. 1982.

[10] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems 2nd Ed.*, Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[11] P. Elias, "Coding for noisy channels," *IRE Convention Record*, Part 4, pp. 37–46, 1955.

[12] U. Erez and G. Miller, "The ML decoding performance of LDPC ensembles over $\boldsymbol{Z}_q$," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-51, no. 5, pp. 1871–1879, May 2005.

[13] R. G. Gallager, *Information Theory and Reliable Communication*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968.

[14] R. G. Gallager, *Low Density Parity Check Codes*, Cambridge, MA:M.I.T Press, 1963.

[15] J. Garcia-Frias and Y. Zhao, "Compression of correlated binary memoryless sources using turbo codes," *IEEE Comm. Letters*, no. 5, pp. 417–419, Oct. 2001.

[16] T.S. Han and S. Verdú, "Approximation theory of output statistics," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-39, no. May, pp. 752–772, May 1993.

[17] T.S. Han, *Information-Spectrum Methods in Information Theory*, Springer, 2003.

[18] J. Honda and H. Yamamoto, "Polar coding without alphabet extension for asymmetric models," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-59, pp. 7829–7838, Dec. 2013.

[19] N. Hussami, S. B. Korada, and R. Urbanke, "Performance of polar codes for channel and source coding," *Proc. 2009 IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory*, Seoul, Korea, 2009, pp. 1488–1492.

[20] R. Impagliazzo and D. Zuckerman, "How to recycle random bits," *30th IEEE Symp. Fund. Computer Sci.*, Oct. 30–Nov. 1, 1989, pp. 248–253.

[21] G. Miller and D. Burshtein, "Bounds on the maximum-likelihood decoding error probability of low-density parity-check codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-47, no. 7, pp. 2696–2710, Nov. 2001.

[22] S. Miyake and J. Muramatsu, "A construction of channel code, JSCC and universal code for discrete memoryless channels using sparse matrices," *IEICE Trans. Fundamentals*, vol. E92-A, No. 9, pp. 2333–2344, Sep. 2009.

[23] S. Miyake and F. Kanaya, "Coding theorems on correlated general sources," *IEICE Trans. Fundamentals*, vol. E78-A, No. 9, pp. 1063–1070, Sept. 1995.

[24] J. Muramatsu, T. Uyematsu, and T. Wadayama, "Low density parity check matrices for coding of correlated sources," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-51, no. 10, pp. 3645–3653, Oct. 2005.

[25] J. Muramatsu and S. Miyake, "Hash property and coding theorems for sparse matrices and maximal-likelihood coding," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-56, no. 5, pp. 2143–2167, May 2010. Corrections: vol. IT-56, no. 9, p. 4762, Sep. 2010, vol. IT-59, no. 10, pp. 6952–6953, Oct. 2013.

[26] J. Muramatsu and S. Miyake, "Construction of Slepian-Wolf source code and broadcast channel code based on hash property," available at `arXiv:1006.5271[cs.IT]`, 2010.

[27] J. Muramatsu and S. Miyake, "Construction of broadcast channel code based on hash property," *Proc. 2010 IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory*, Austin, U.S.A., June 13–18, pp. 575–579, 2010.

[28] J. Muramatsu and S. Miyake, "Construction of strongly secure wiretap channel code based on hash property," *Proc. of 2011 IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory*, St. Petersburg, Russia, Jul. 31–Aug. 5, 2011, pp. 612–616.

[29] J. Muramatsu, "Channel coding and lossy source coding using a generator of constrained random numbers," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-60, no. 5, pp. 2667–2686, May 2014.

[30] J. Muramatsu, "Variable-length lossy source code using a constrained-random-number generator," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-61, no. 6, Jun. 2015.

[31] T. Murayama, "Statistical mechanics of data compression theorem," *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, vol. 35: L95L100, 2002.

[32] D. Slepian and J. K. Wolf, "Noiseless coding of correlated information sources," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-19, no. 4, pp. 471–480, Jul. 1973.

[33] D. Schonberg, S. S. Pradhan, and K. Ramchandran, "LDPC codes can approach the Slepian-Wolf bound for general binary sources," *40th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, Allerton House, Monticello, Illinois, Oct. 2002.

[34] S. Verdú and T.S. Han, "A general formula for channel capacity," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-40, no. 4, pp. 1147–1157, Jul. 1994.

[35] A. D. Wyner, "Recent results in the Shannon theory," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-20, pp. 2–10, Jan. 1974.

[36] M. H. Yassaee, M. R. Aref, and A. Gohari, "Achievability proof via output statistics of random binning," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. IT-60, no. 11, pp. 6760-6786, Nov. 2014.